

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner object to the specification, rejected claim 20 under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112, and rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 103(a). These rejections are fully traversed below. In addition, the examiner allowed claim 1.

Claim 20 has been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-21 remain pending. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Cross Reference to Related Applications section of the application. The Cross Reference to Related Applications section has been amended to clarify the same as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIM 20 UNDER 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 20 under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite due to an informality. Claim 20 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 20.

### **PATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-20**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,514,084. These rejections are fully traversed. Submitted together herewith is a terminal disclaimer with reference to U.S. Patent No. 6,514,084 and other patents. This terminal disclaimer obviates the rejection of claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting. Notwithstanding, it should be understood that the Applicant does not admit, acquiesce or otherwise agree with the rejection. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the

rejection of claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting.

### **SUMMARY**

It is submitted that the objection to the specification has been overcome. In addition, it is submitted that claim 20 is sufficiently definite. Still further, the rejection to claims 1-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting should be withdrawn. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. RLC1G000).

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

(650) 961-8300